Ham-Space Digest   Sun, 13 Mar 94   Volume 94 : Issue   56

Today's Topics:
                          new stsplus?? (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 12 Mar 94 19:22:28 -0500
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa
Subject: new stsplus??
To: ham-space@ucsd.edu

I have heard a few rumors about SOP94???, and that it tracks
multiple sats. Any info on validity, ftp availability,
or otherwise would be grealyly appreciated

thanks

pete brunelli
n1qdq

Date: Sun, 13 Mar 1994 09:36:41 +0000
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!demon!isis.demon.co.uk!
ian@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: new stsplus??
To: ham-space@ucsd.edu

In article <BE7sY6c.brunelli_pc@delphi.com> brunelli_pc@delphi.com writes:

>I have heard a few rumors about SOP94???, and that it tracks
>multiple sats. Any info on validity, ftp availability,
>or otherwise would be grealyly appreciated
>
>thanks
>
>pete brunelli
>n1qdq
>

I thought that STSPLUS had tracked multiple sats since version 9333.
Having said that, there appears to be several new versions per year,
so a 94?? has probable appeared. For some reason, STSPLUS has always
been hard to get via FTP. The BBS is the best place and CIS appears
to be kept up to date. FWIW the latest I've seen is 9353.

Regards
Ian.
--

   | Ian Smith | "The Moving Finger writes;
   | ian@isis.demon.co.uk | and, having writ, Moves on."

Date: 12 Mar 1994 22:27:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!gag.com!bdale@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-space@ucsd.edu

References <2lh20r$auf@bigfoot.wustl.edu>, <CMEnED.G1M@hpcvsnz.cv.hp.com>,
<1994Mar11.185311.15115@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>
Subject : Re: GPS Receiver Boards

bonomo@specxn.enet.dec.com wrote:

: I've sent for the specs from Motorola...

: If the product is up to snuff...

I've worked with, or have friends who have worked with, the Rockwell, Trimble,
and Motorola receiver cores. Concensus is that the Motorola core is the best
for time-transfer applications. The Trimble has a well-defined but annoying
jitter to the 1pps signal, the Rockwell gives a 1pps signal that is precise
and fairly stable but not aligned with the edge of a second, complicating
host software.

All give good results for position and velocity applications. If you want to
fly them on weather balloons and such, the Motorola behaves best, holding the
last valid position when you hit the COCOM restriction height, the Trimble
resets to their corporate offices in CA, reportedly. I don't know anyone who
has flown a Rockwell in this application.

The Rockwell has a GaAs frontend so can work well with non-amplified patch
antennas over short coax runs. The Trimble and Motorola units benefit from
an amplified patch or better antenna.

In summary, if ya gotta do a group purchase, go with the Mot units, and if the
price is good, I know a dozen or so folks (working on the AMSAT P3D GPS
project) who are likely to be interested in buying one to play with.

73 - Bdale, N3EUA

Date: 13 Mar 1994 00:12:27 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!
palmer@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-space@ucsd.edu

References <CMEnED.G1M@hpcvsnz.cv.hp.com>,
<1994Mar11.185311.15115@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <2ltfkh$31f@winfree.gag.com>
Subject : Re: GPS Receiver Boards

bdale@gag.com (Bdale Garbee) writes:

>All give good results for position and velocity applications. If you want to
>fly them on weather balloons and such, the Motorola behaves best, holding the
>last valid position when you hit the COCOM restriction height, the Trimble
>resets to their corporate offices in CA, reportedly. I don't know anyone who
>has flown a Rockwell in this application.

Apparently the restriction is only required when you exceed certain
altitude AND speed limit simultaneously. Our group has successfully
used GPS (the Rockwell card, I am ~90% sure) on scientific balloons
(~125,000 feet, but typically much less than a hundred miles per hour).
We were warned that early versions of the board we used would not
work, because it unnecesarily restricted at either a certain altitude
OR speed limit.

Contact the companies for futher details.
--
  David M. Palmer   palmer@alumni.caltech.edu
     palmer@tgrs.gsfc.nasa.gov
 Clipper: Privacy for people who have nothing to hide.

****
****